to women's property. These are just a few examples. A foreign government cannot be responsible for drastic social reforms. The result is religious neutrality, and only too often the perpetuation of ancient abuses.

The Congress grew as the expression of the demands of a discontented middle class; as such, it had to play a progressive role, but because of the peculiar conditions that role was strictly limited. For instance, Gandhi's work for the Untouchables. But the Muslims were dominated by a semi-feudal class. The broad masses of the Muslim population are always potentially revolutionary,[1] agitating about something or other, and their great poverty leads to rapid radicalisation, which finds no adequate leadership among the communalists nor even in the Congress. The Muslims were drawn to Gandhi in 1920 because he seemed objectively revolutionary, just as recently they have been drawn to Jawarhalal Nehru. But, as we have seen, the Congress is still to some extent linked up with the capitalist class and only a small percentage is consciously revolutionary; its energies can easily be absorbed in social reformism of a mild type, but this will not do for the Muslims. They are afraid of the Hindu capitalist, for they have only about 4 per cent, share in the capital investment of the country. (I have not been able to verify or prove this figure.) The vast preponderance of the Muslim community consists of craftsmen and artisans, makers of silk and carpets. Those who have not already been ruined by the competition of Indian and foreign factory goods are in daily

dread that they will be soon. *

In the towns the Muslims are far. poorer than the Hindus. But the vocal elements among the Muslims are either landed gentry or connected with them. Separate electorates have

[1] This statement has been criticised by some friends, but it is the view of one who has worked among the Muslim masses.